

Chapter 12 Four Theatric Styles of Leader Behavior (Bureaucratic, Prince, Heroic & Superman)

OUT OF THE BOX - My purpose here is to work with Weber, Burns, Machiavelli, and Nietzsche's theories of leadership; to discern the roots of what I call Leadership is Theatre. There are fewer heroes today than ever before, but princes are everywhere (all pretending to be heroes). There are hardly any supermen or superwomen. The bureaucratic iron cage and the McDonaldization of the corporate scene have made the system, its efficient teams of munchkins more important than real people. Leadership theory is dead because it has killed the subject; the leader has been replaced by behaviors, situations, and profiles. But beware, behind this simulation, the leaders do live on, playing their scenes with theatric skill. The audience conspires in the death of the leader. The audience does not trust the Prince, fears the Hero will change things too much, and the Superwoman/Superman could create revolution. Best to let the scientists have their way. They have reduced leadership to simple charts, lists of behaviors and traits; notice how initiating structure, consideration, and participation in this or that situation is just all about bureaucracy, not much more. And transformational leaders, with charisma and vision; is this some call for the hero to take the stage, or even yearning for superwoman/superman? The science of leadership pretends that people do not matter; only traits, skills, behaviors, and situations matter. In the theatrics of leadership, the person is reborn, at least the masks are visible to us on a wide array of stages (board room, stockholder meeting, news reels, documentaries, training video, and corporate web sites). It is not evolution. It is an act. It is not the stuff of situational determinism or functionality. It is not a pattern of measurable traits. No, it is just theater, fooling leader science into thinking the illusions are the real behaviors and the situations are forcing one to act this way or that.

THESIS: Great leaders are a delicate and rare mix of the qualities of the Prince, the Hero, the Superwoman/Superman, and the Bureaucrat. And there are fewer Heroes and more Princes and Bureaucrats than ever before. Max Weber (1947) distinguished between the bureaucratic and the heroic charismatic leader, as well as the traditional (feudal) leader. For George MacGregor Burns (1978) Princely political leaders and Bureaucratic leaders were engaged in transaction behaviors and modal moral values (means instead of ends). For Burns, Weber's charismatic Heroic leader was the epitome of transformational behaviors and transcendent moral values (ends over means). Burns had less to say about the Princes or what Weber termed the Sultans of his Traditional (Feudal) leader. Burns did not believe great men should be driven by ambition or the need for power. Machiavelli (1610) disagreed. *The Prince* is the première text on ambitious leadership, and treating people as objects, as means to ends. This dualism of being against or for ambition has split the leadership into half, as depicted in Figure two (top versus bottom theories of leadership). Nietzsche thought that leadership was beyond simple choices of good versus evil. The novel I am reading captures this point:

All the great men of history were driven by ambition. It goes hand in hand with power. Contrary to public opinion, the world is not divided by good and evil, but between those who do and those who do not, the visionaries

and the blind, the realists and the romanticists. The world does not turn on good deeds and sentiments... but on achievements (Cussler, 1997: 281, Flood Tide).

	WILL TO SERVE OTHERS			
T R A N S A C T I O N A L	1. <u>BUREAUCRATIC LEADER</u>	Bureaucrat pretending to be heroic; Hero who is tamed by bureaucracy	3. <u>HEROIC LEADER</u>	T R A N S F O R M A T I O N A L
	Bureaucrat pretending to be the prince; Prince who has become engulfed by bureaucratic counter measures	<u>EXECUTIVE LEADER W/ 4 CHOICES?</u>	Heroic leader who leaves the group to find self; Superman who becomes puppet of group	
	2. <u>PRINCE LEADER</u>	Prince who gains power but does not know how to handle it; Superman who becomes prince	4. <u>SUPERMAN/ SUPERWOMAN LEADER</u>	
	WILL TO POWER			

Figure One: Four Types of Leaders and their Hybrids © David M. Boje

The horizontal dimension is Transactional to Transformational. The vertical dimension is from Will to Serve others to the Will to Power.

Figure One crosses the X and Y dimensions of transaction to transformation with WTS to WTP. The horizontal X dimension of transactional to transformational made famous in the work of George MacGregor Burns (1978) and Bernard M. Bass (1985); and the vertical Y dimension I am adding, extends from the will to serve others to the will to power of Friedrich Nietzsche (writing in the 1870s). Burns and Bass restrict leadership to the bureaucratic transactional and heroic/ charismatic approaches (cells 1 and 3) to a will to serve others. I would like to resituate leadership by including the work of Machiavelli

and Nietzsche (cells 2 and 4). Burns, more than Bass, disqualifies leaders who wield power, including those with a strong "will to power" as well as tyrants and dictators who use power in what Burns and Bass see as amoral. In short, the contemporary transaction/transformation duality restricts leadership moral uses of power, to the will to serve others. Burns sees the transactional leader as either opinion leader, group leader, party, legislative, or executive leader. In each case, the transaction leader "requires a shrewd eye for opportunity, a good hand at bargaining, persuading, reciprocating" (p. 169). The transactional leader approaches followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions.

Burns' transformational leader can be an intellectual, reform, revolutionary, or (charismatic) hero. The transformational leader "recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower... (and) looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower" (Burns, 1978: 4). Few, if any, leadership theorists have noted the transactional aspects of Weber's (1947) model of the three leaderly authorities. Yet, what Weber theorized is quite consistent (though not identical) with the transactional theory of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). All do recognize Weber's charismatic leaderly authority, but never seem to read the part about the routinization of charisma, or see how bureaucratic transaction and heroic charisma interact with the third category of authority, the traditional feudalistic enactment of the Sultan and Chief. Burns and Bass seem to accept a linear progress model of leaderly power and authority that suggests that transaction and transformation are beyond the feudalistic form.

A bureaucracy is also quite a modal (mean-become-ends) institution, in which both leaders and followers become objects and become servants to others (it is supposed to work that way, but doesn't). In bureaucratic leadership, the Prince intrudes, and the ends of serving the people become displaced by the means, survival at all costs and fiefdoms develop everywhere. Even in [Alfred Chandler's M-Form](#) (multidivisional professional bureaucracy) this means-ends displacement happens. Contemporary leadership theories of transaction (Bureaucracy and Prince) and transformation (Quest for the Hero) have had very little to say about Niccolo Machiavelli's or Frederick Nietzsche's leadership theory, the Prince and the Superman/ Superwoman.

Yet, for Machiavelli's strategic advice to Prince, the types of power Burns finds amoral, and therefore outside his definition of leadership, is still, I think, very much in evidence today. And so is the Superman, the will to power of Nietzsche. Figure One, therefore is an effort to resituate the discussion of transactional and transformational leadership by adding a second, vertical dimension. To me the Princely leader is concerned about the means of power, and will sacrifice ends over means. However, the Superman or Superwoman leader is more transformational than transactional (For more on this topic please see [Transformational Leadership](#), [Charismatic Leadership](#), and the [Theatrics of Leadership](#) study guides).

The leader mixes four roles in the theatrics of leadership:



1. BUREAUCRATIC LEADER

Max Weber argued that the capitalist entrepreneur has the choice of charismatic, feudal, and bureaucratic authority. And other things being equal bureaucracy gets selected, and the bureaucracy prefers the bureaucratic leader to the hero, prince or superman/superwoman. [For more on Weber](#); also see [Fathers and Mother of Management Site](#).

Leaders have been tamed by the modernist era. The herd abhors a non-bureaucratic leader. Departmentalization (division of labor), hierarchy, and now teams has defanged the executive leader. Global corporate society has drifted into the anonymity of the virtual corporate network, subcontracting to factories, who subcontract to unknown producers. As a result, leaders are alienated from their own will to power, and must masquerade and camouflage their power.

Search for trait theory, behavior theory, situation theory, and even transformation theory killed off the "leader" as a person, as a human being that makes history.

Bureaucratic leaders are what Whyte calls "organization man." Leadership has been defined in ways that fit the need for the organization to survive without risk. Feudal and premodern society had called for this new form of leadership; the modern age of bureaucracy.

Initiating structure and consideration are attempts to cage leadership within the bureaucratic frame; leadership is dead. In organizations with division of labor and HR departments, such behavioral factors of leaders work well; although measuring their impact seems elusive).

The system and culture and group has become more important and more alive than the leader, who is now dead.

In the bureaucratic mindset, people are selected, trained, and disciplined to no longer see themselves as powerful. Thus they must be reborn and "empowered." Leaders must alienate themselves from power and politics, the stuff of feudal and charismatic organization, that bureaucracy was meant to displace. In the bureaucracy there is no room for super star or powerful performances. Best pretend to be impersonal and hide behind committees (sorry now they are teams) and reports, charts and numbers.

Bureaucracy dethroned the Prince, Hero and Superman/Superwoman Leader. The CEO knows full well that he does not "run" or "rule" the corporation, but is a member of an impersonal team, a network of committees. The responsible executive (Prince, Hero or Superman/Superwoman) has been replaced by the responsible team. There is no more opportunity to be her, but there is some opportunity to play at being the Prince. And there is a recent resurgence of spirit at work, where the executive works on their superman/superwoman, superior inner awareness and sensitivity, rather than charting the direction of the firm.

With the Hawthorne studies of the late 1920s the group became a more important factor than the individual in explaining effectiveness.

🌐 Bureaucracy is suspicious of the heroic style; heroic styles are steeped in intuition and mystic callings, which is dangerous to the bureaucratic way of being in the world.

🌐 Executives buy lots of books about helping elephants to dance or teaching buffalos to fly; they yearn for the romantic age when leadership meant the power to take action.

People call out for the bureaucratic executive to lead, to give more direction, vision, and set out on a transformative campaign. But that leader died long ago. Now the leader reads the situation, tweaks variables, and keeps a low profile. Best not to be too risky, too innovative, but still appear to be doing these dangerous things.

🌐 Modern Examples: Charles Sorensen (executive in Henry Ford's empire), Harry Bennett (henchman in Ford's empire), Frank Kulick, executive who was made to lie prone on the running board of a car driven by Bennett and then driven through the plant gate and spun about until he was thrown from the fast moving car (Jennings, 1960: 59). Also Herbert Hoover and a long list of presidents of US.

🌐 For more on the bureaucratic mindset, see [BUREAUCRATIC](#).



2. PRINCE LEADER

🌐 NOTE: The [TRAIT STUDY Guide](#) has more on Machiavelli

🌐 "From this rises the question whether it is better to be loved than feared, or feared more than loved" Machiavelli ([Machiavelli's portrait](#); [Press for Prince image with quote](#)). [Press for The Prince book](#) and all its chapters on WWW.

🌐 Machiavelli thought the power to change kingdoms and societies rested with the superior talents of great men, the Princes.



🌐 **MISREADING MACHIAVELLI** - Here are common mistakes and correctives:

There are positive and negative Princes - Superficial readings of Machiavelli (*The Prince* and *Discourses* books) focus on the cruel and tyrannical Princes, ignoring Machiavelli's Prince of Peace (Jesus) and other positive princes. There was a virtuous Machiavellian leader (more in *Discourses* than *Prince*) who used power in a tough-minded fashion to benefit the community (Masters, 1996: 188). Where Plato preferred the enlightened philosophy-king, Machiavelli imagined the Prince who would make the tough choices in hard times, and be merciful in bountiful ones.

Theory of Human Nature is more than fear. Rather, human social organization is based upon three passions (love, fear, and hate). Machiavelli presents us with a three factor theory of leadership:


- Leaders "can be 'loved', usually by being 'liberal' and 'merciful'."
- Leaders "can be 'hated' because they are too 'rapacious' in taking the 'property and women' of citizens or are perceived as 'effeminate' by the military."
- Leaders "can be 'feared' without being hated, as is the case when 'greatness, spiritedness, gravity, and strength are recognized' in their 'actions'" (See Prince, ch. 19: 71-72; as cited in Masters, 1996: 138).


Princes have Situational Styles - Superficial readings assume Machiavelli is trait theory of leadership, and therefore not situational. Yet, situational leadership is at the heart of his theory, in that sometimes you need a negative Prince who is a strong leader in tough times. In good times a positive leader while work. A knowledge of the situation was required to know when to act with love, hate or fear. Machiavelli saw the situation of leadership as like a "river" that flowed, changed, to present or withdraw fortune. It could be controlled with dikes (good arms and inventions) and dams (good laws and virtues) but accidents and natural catastrophe could flood the land with violence. This is not dissimilar from today's chaos and complexity theory of situation. Leaders tried to divert rivers and change their flow into new channels (while avoiding foreign invasions and civil wars). The Prince developed knowledge of the situation to control fortune. Unlike the situation leadership theories of today, Machiavelli saw chance as organizing and controlling human fortune. Chapter 25 of *The Prince*, envisioned a class of leaders, trained in and with good counsel in practical wisdom, scientific knowledge, and the art of war, could control "about half" the historical events attributed to chance (Masters, 1996: 192).


Machiavelli was interested in more than Feudal Kingdoms. Rather, the republicanism and senates also had their Princes. Such princes could enact leadership that meant "good laws and good arms" for "the common good." While Machiavelli would have scoffed at democratic equality that was not earned by performance, he was not though the power of Princely leaders must be balanced by the obligation to serve the common good (Masters, 1996: 231). Yet he did not subscribe to the universal theories of enlightenment (of Hobbes or Descartes), he did preach that leaders need to know and keep certain truths from the masses. which given the popularity now of TV and Nintendo and the decline of classical education in favor of technical and vocational one, is not hard to achieve. "Today, many articles and books delight in cataloguing popular ignorance of elementary facts in geography, history and government" (Masters, 1996: 222). The point is that Machiavelli recognized the need to groom leaders who would work for the common good.


Machiavelli is more than a premodern historical interest - Machiavelli wrote in Premodern (Renaissance) but his ideas are relevant to both Modern and Postmodern Leader Theory. Premodern princes used the spectacles of the staged event, modern


leaders added the printed storyline, and postmodern leaders use TV and Internet to morph their image to the masses.


 **Premodern Princes** - use spectacles in the town square; a good hanging or a gladiators in the coliseum would persuade the empire. Foucault's (1979) opening theatrics scene in *Discipline and Punish* is Damien being drawn and quartered, but the spectacle is poorly performed by the executioner; Damien meanwhile is playing the saint to his audience by refusing to swear and forgiving his tormenters and torturers. The fact that a public spectacle draw the King's authority (as a God sent) into question, took punishment (hangings and torture as entertainment and lessons in leadership) out of the town square and into the prison dungeon. Yet, even inside Versailles Louis IV and Mary Antoinette had a steady stream of spectators viewing their grooming, eating, and mating habits. The tour of Versailles was then a way to govern, now it is just Disneyfied tourism.


 **Modern Princes** - use the invention of the printing press to sway the masses. Hitler used theatric spectacles (staged complex choreographed marches and programs) and long, carefully crafted speeches to erect a charismatic image. Hitler used the media to craft his omniscient image as Princely leader. Hitler and Stalin rejected the free press in favor of state-controlled propaganda machines (Masters, 1996: 155). But so did Roosevelt, Churchill, MacArthur and other modern Princes. Hamilton, Madison & Jay used the printing press to convince voters in New York to ratify the American constitution (Masters, 1996: 153).


 **Postmodern Princes** - use television sound bites and corrupt visual images to change the political and emotional attitudes of viewers and the buying habits of consumers eager to define their role in popular culture through their symbolic purchases ([See Guy Debord](#)). Every campaign has a web site, and web images travel quicker than print or TV. "What it took Hitler massive theatrical preparations to stage at Nuremberg is achieved routinely on the nightly news of every country in the world: (Masters, 1996: 156). Leaders and celebrities are now commodities: packaged with sound bites, story spins, and images to manipulate the public who will buy label over substance. The postmodern Prince and their enemy become simulations and theatrical illusions in Wag the Dog media spectacles.

 William Horton Jr. became "Willie" in the anti-Dukakis TV ad campaign of Bush supporters (Masters, 1996: 146).

 Bush went from went to "kinder, gentler" leader with sound bites about "a thousand lites," "the unfortunate," and images of the flag (p. 147).

 Ross Perot in 1992 used TV exposure to gain 1/5h of the vote.

 The 2000 US national presidential conventions were theatric events, with carefully scripted press releases, each day of the campaign an act in a play with a definite plot, and each actor knowing exactly what lines to say each day. Meanwhile the deals and gluttonous spectacle being staged for conventioners at the corporate parties of the PACs were kept away from the wide angle lenses of the camera.

 Corporate CEOs from Phil Knight to Michael Eisner use TV and WWW to craft their Princely images. And activists resist with their own Web crusades and press releases. Print journalists with corporate ad money are caught between this thesis and antithesis flow of information.

■ With TV and WWW there is the illusion of a direct hyper link between leader and every citizen (p. 156).

● Postmodern Princes have several Achilles' heels.

The WWW can mobilize the kinds of resistance and carnivalesque theatrics we saw in Seattle protests of WTO, with a hundred different interest groups mobilizing to oppose the leaders of the corporate world empire.

An aggressive, cruel, and otherwise violent Prince does not come across well on TV; who invites a lion into their living room? "A leader can no longer show anger and high arousal that 'work' [better] when speakers address huge crowds" (Masters, 1996: 156). On the other hand, presenting a bland, safe image does not attract viewer attention. Still Regan's non-verbal behavior (smiling, while protesters scowled) before the camera, could change public opinion polls in his favor.

The public is getting more sophisticated about deconstructing hyper images such as "Willie Horton" or Nike's infamous ads about females and minorities breaking class barriers (while 3rd world girls of color work in sweatshops). The impressions created by symbolic manipulation evaporate (even boil over into controversy) when de-coded as pseudo-images. Promises of progress, happiness and equality through consumption turn out to be masks for privilege and power of corporate greed.

The Postmodern Princes are no longer politicians and CEOs, they are sports and movie celebrities. This is part of the postmodern turn from the economics of production to that of consumption. Leader Princes manufacture their images, or hire consultants to do so. But viewers are not so naive (we hope).

● Since Plato the leader was someone who took action, began projects, and achieved. Leaders were great persons, drawn by spiritual and mystical forces.

● The prince is a power seeker (The lion and the fox). The rising bourgeoisie class saw the need to constrain the power of the prince; better to let the bureaucrats change the details, than for a Prince to change the game.

● In contemporary times the heroic executive may be a prince in disguise. The CEO strives to get to the top not for the organization, but totally for him or herself.

● Despite the modern era, the feudal empire is still part of corporate reality. And the prince aspires to head up the feudal corporate kingdom. The executive is the little monarch, building a mega-empire on a global stage. Despite the modern bureaucracy and the postmodern virtual network, the prince is still weaving the web with manipulative skill.

● Every executive denies that they are a politician. To be a politician, would be to admit that corporations are engaged in a constant struggle for power.

● The corporate prince is a shaker and a mover, who wears the mask of the hero; he pretends to be in the service of a great corporate mission. For Machiavelli the prince led the power struggle as if it were a game of chess. He moved his pawns, tricked his knights, and captured the queen.

- Princes are subtle in their maneuvering and manipulation of people (the Fox).
- Prince leaders seek status and power. And in a bureaucracy, the princely leader plays the politics of departments, in-groups, and rivalry.
- The Prince will conjure up a great mission to appear heroic, but the boon is power itself and no other prize. Princes can use hero worship to their advantage. Princes learn to walk, talk, and act like heroes.
- Contemporary corporate princes are skillful in getting support, popularity, an rapport with a minimum of general resistance or involvement is heavy issues (Jennings, 1960: 230).
- The princely corporate executive is caught in a system in which there are few opportunities to play out heroic roles, and succeeding gets redefined into winning at power struggles.
- Princes try to write autobiographies that record themselves as heroes.
- The Lion and the Fox are interdependent roles (what Roosevelt was referred to).
- Lion - cannot protect himself from traps. He needs the fox to trip the traps. The lion uses spectacle to give proof of his prowess, strength, and violence.
- Fox - cannot protect himself from wolves. He needs the lion to roar at the wolves and frighten them away. Fox has a tendency to deceive and use disguise. The fox can feign weakness or friendship, even love, then commit treachery. The fox avoids hatred among the masses. Foxes are shrewd.



● Rules of the Fox: [source \(red fox\)](#) Welcome to FOX ISLAND!

1. Never make common cause with another more powerful than yourself to do injury to a third person; Do not be under the will or pleasure of others who are more powerful.
2. Chaos and confusion grow out of your clever manipulations.
3. Do not select subordinates who think of themselves as more that the Prince.
4. Use propaganda to establish reputation and image; It is best to appear virtuous in character trait; appearing brilliant is also a good tool.
5. Never speak a plan until the moment of its execution.
6. Maintain flexibility by engaging in lengthy inquiry into alternative actions.
7. Never get backed into a corner without options; keep a minuet in reserve to take the blame for any failure. If this fails, seek a group to be responsible.
8. Place a stick in every trap to dissipate its energy and to be able to roam freely.
9. Never let your ability fall below what is required to actually maintain your power.
10. Note that cunning schemes are subject to the roll of the dice, to the wings of fortune.

11. In public gatherings such as conferences, committees or even informal meetings, never be anything less than noble and more; above all, never appear too eager or overtly ambitious (Jennings, 1960: 226).
12. Do not make apparent resources apart from position, since the tendency to impute ambition to the individual who displays personal talents
13. Let each situation dictate leader techniques and plans of action. Prince sees no overall strategy except that which reflects the on-going and established interests of various claimant (stakeholder) groups (p. 228). Therefore, do not get boxed in by bureaucratic formulas or heroic grand plans of innovative action (that could veer off track).



Rules of the Lion: [source](#)

1. Put on the gladiator spectacle
2. Engage in conspicuous acts of violence to instill fear in the masses.
3. Sometimes you have to bite off a few heads to keep the spectators in line.
4. Pounce with great fury.
5. Surprise the victim with terror.
6. convince the masses that at times you must act with great valor (lion).
7. Let lieutenants vindicate themselves in the pull and tug of conflict, until a better course of action wins out.
8. Wait in the brush with patience and silence until the timing is right for the assault.
9. Aggressiveness is better than consideration.
10. Never leave a wounded enemy alive; never leave the relative of someone you killed alive.

Human relations has sought to put hurdles in the way of both Lion and Fox. Bureaucratic controls such as group meetings, conferences, division of labor, and participation attempt to counteract the Princely powers. The drive to dominate and secure power is seen as inappropriate to modern corporate culture (so the Prince must wear the mask).

Premodern Examples: Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Cesare Borgia, Queen Elizabeth.

Modern Examples: Cornelius Vanderbilt, John D. Rockefeller, Sr., Gould, Fisk, Leland Stanford, Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, Roosevelt, Walt Disney. Robber barons and captains of industry - Ford for example created the five-dollar work day (it was \$4 at the time) to be seen as humanitarian, while cutting higher paid employees, and getting workers to step up their output by 47% to get that extra dollar. (Jennings, 1960: 60-61). It was a noble myth that covered over the sweatshops of the day. For moved his men about the chessboard with the crude power of the Prince.

Postmodern Examples: Phil Knight, Michael Eisner, CEO of Monsanto. These CEO try hard to persuade the masses that they are sincere; that they are lovers of the common

man. Phil Knight for example, sustains his aloofness, keeping apart from his employees, while using many advertising dollars to convince the public that there are no sweatshops, Third world women work in the best conditions, and that his leadership has led to economic development and progress in Third World nations.

● HYPOTHESIS: Prince leaders are proliferating while heroic leaders are getting more scarce.



3. HEROIC LEADER

The hero type of leader acts as though possessed by a destiny that requires his being the center of attention, and having arrived there, he never willingly retires from the center until he feels no longer needed (Jennings, 1960: 96).

A hero's cause requires great stamina, self-reliance, and confidence, without which the forces that keep people within bounds of uniformity will engulf the hero and his cause (p. 122).

- For Weber, the charismatic leader was the most heroic leader.
- We all want to see a heroic leader act to serve the charismatic cause of society and corporate transformation. Since Weber, the transformational leader has been one who is charismatic. And Weber says that the charisma would undergo routinization, to be less a threat to bureaucratic capitalism. Still the charismatic leader, could be useful to promote reform and revolution when the bureaucracy turned static and even traditional with fiefdoms everywhere. For more on Weber's three ideal types (bureaucratic, charismatic (hero), and traditional Sultanism (prince), [see the Weber web site](#).
- For Jennings, Carlyle and Mill, the heroic leader "has a kind of religious sense of mystical awareness of a greater life existing beyond mere appearance" (Jennings, 1960: 73).
- The hero was a product of his past, his present social milieu (including friends and teachers), his economic class, and his calling to discover a higher self by undertaking a great and dangerous journey.
- Don Campbell gave us the paradigm of the hero's journey.
 - The call to adventure - and the hero is usually reluctant to go and must be tricked, coerced or seduced to go.
 - The helpers - along the journey the leader picks up helpmates, guides and prophets.
 - There are trials and tribulations, even tragedies to overcome.
 - Enemies get harder and harder to overcome.
 - The hero defeats the inner enemy while vanquishing the outer one.
 - The hero returns with the boon to free the people from bondage or ignorance; the Holy Grail (the boon or elixir that will free the people).
- Currently there is a search for servant leaders, the hero who will be in bondage to the organization. Heroes can end up being puppets for some great mission or idea.

- The heroic leaders has a deep and dedicated sense of mission. The heroic leader can devote themselves fully to the mission of the organization; if this devotion is excessive, they give themselves; their is a loss of self.
- The bureaucrat may be powerless to control the mega corporation, but likes to wear the hero's halo. Yet, in reality, he or she is one of a long line of executives, each adding another dot in a line of dots (Jennings, 1960: 222). No major innovation happens on their watch; heroic leadership is an illusion and a facade.
- The leader may have to become the Prince to cajole, manipulate and maneuver those along the way of his mission. But, seeking Princely power is not what the Hero has in mind. Power is a means to an end, not the end itself. Yet naked power grabbing will be met by opponents come forth to enter and control the game.
- Wisdom comes from intuition and discovery, not empiricism.
- The heroes of the 1800s to late 1900s were production types who began industries and created inventions. The heroes of 2000s are sports figures and celebrities; heroes who have fortunes that come consumerism, not from production. This is the classic shift from Marx to Debord, from spectacle of production that Marx wrote about in mid-1800s to spectacle of consumption that Debord uses to define the postmodern condition.
- Icons are representative of saints; they are not necessarily leaders, the stand for something we also aspire to stand for. So celebrities (movie stars, TV casters) and sports figures are icons are not leaders.
- Premodern Examples: Lord Nelson, George Washington, Abe Lincoln, John Kennedy
- Modern Examples: Winston Churchill, Charles De Gaulle, Theodor Vail (AT&T), John Paul Getty; Ford began is a hero-inventor, then became the Prince. Roosevelt had heroic qualities that inspired followers.
- Postmodern Examples: Sports legends such as Michael Jordan and Tiger Woods; Celebrities such as Whoopi Goldberg, Madonna, and Cher. Corporate celebrities such as Michael Eisner, Bill Gates, Phil Knight, Steve Jobs, etc. Virtual heroes such as Mickey Mouse, Betty Boop, and the Marlboro Man simulate desire in consumers.
- Hypothesis heroes of production have been replaced by the heroes of consumption (Jennings, 1960: 116). We have entered a heroless age; a craving for material things and taking others and the world for granted. The idea of a hero on the battlefield or on a journey has fragmented into an amorphous crowd of consumers worshipping the celebrity and sports personality, channel surfing to a designer experience of heroic spectacle, but without the risk of the premodern hero. Today's heroes do not want to risk hardship or too much danger. Las Vegas Pyramid is preferred to the one in Egypt. Th more we hear CEOs use heroic jargon, the more absurd the work life becomes.
- For more on the heroic leader, see [QUEST](#).



4. SUPERMAN/ SUPERWOMAN LEADER

The essence of leadership is the ability to be and do differently, not because of weakness such as is found in the current pre-occupation with power seeking, but because of strength that comes from a sense of duty and responsibility to one's unique self. The individual who is a point of contact with the future and who creates new values or goals is called a superior man... we might just as easily call him the free man. Friedrich Nietzsche used the term superman (Superwoman also applies) (Jennings, 1960: 125, additions mine).

Frederich Nietzsche crafted the superwoman/superman leader theory. In 1873 he wrote that the world is waiting for superman/superwoman to destroy the weak habits of a thousand years and replace them with new ones. [For more on Nietzsche](#); also see [Fathers and Mother of Management Site](#).

- Will to power is central to establishing personal sovereignty.
- A will to power is a move beyond the impulse to live up to other's expectations; The superman/superwoman is self-directed, not other-directed.
- There is discipline of the self; to find your worth and dignity as an individual human being.
- Striving for a life plan that culminates in establishing a strong (normal striving for power & inner), determined, self-controlled, and unique character.
- Dominates others when it reflects path to self-control (not end itself as with Prince).
- A will to power is a will to be self-directed, to find freedom, originality and creativity.
- Does not lose sense of self in the cause (in contrast to hero).
- The will to power is the drive to do away with the mask and to display power openly and be genuinely free men.
- anything that impedes superman/superwoman's development is abhorred (summarized from Jennings, 1960: 125-135 and Nietzsche's Will to Power).



For Nietzsche the world is chaos and it takes a leader of great strength to change history.

The higher and the terrible leader inhabit the same body. The fallacy of leadership science is to ignore the terrible, and pretend that leaders wear the halo. Thus Nietzsche's call "Beyond Good and Evil." "Everything good is the evil of former days made serviceable" (Will to Power #1025).

Man is beast and superbeast; the higher man is inhuman and superhuman; these belong together" (Will to Power #1027).

Will to power is a "high spirituality" the "gratitude toward earth and life" (#1033). Nietzsche uses the word Dionysian, the life forces that are beyond good and evil; as

opposed to Apollonian antithesis forces that conquer desire for life, to rule over the will to freedom.

■ The Will to Power is a desire for life and to be free, "a Dionysian affirmation of the world as it is, without subtraction, exception, or selection" (#1041).

■ "*This world is the will to power - and nothing besides!*" (#1067).

● Nietzsche though "to place the goal in the herd and not in single individuals" was a basic error (Will to Power, #766). Nietzsche was not in favor of socialism or democracy, just greatness.

● The degree of resistance that must be continually overcome by a will to power to remain on top is for Nietzsche the measure of freedom. One must have no choice: either on top or underneath... one must oppose tyrants to become a tyrant, i.e., *free*" (Will to Power #771).

● For Nietzsche, Will to Power was partly Machiavellian. The oppressed (e.g. slaves) have a will to *freedom*. Getting ready for power is a will to overpower, the will to *justice*. (#776).

● The individual submerged in serving the institution has little self-consciousness.

● Marx believed that history would see the rise of the working class and their ascension to leadership. It did not happen.

● The superman/superwoman puts their self in order (their own house), then their institution, and the world. It is a personal crusade to restore the free man/woman and the independent spirit within a society that has turned bureaucratic.

● The problem is how not to become absorbed by a cause or an institution.

● The fully organized and controlled modern bureaucratic life threatens the emergence of the superman/superwoman by surrounding him or her with conformity norms and surveillance. As does the postmodern network of connectedness among organizations that control the orbit of power and control (at the very least the stage moves from local to global). Complexity of both huge corporation and networks of organizations may exceed the ability of any one individual to realize either heroic or superman/superwoman leadership.

● At the same time working in a Transorganizational (multi organizational) milieu provides more opportunities to play an active and aggressive role of personal strength. This is especially true where recharting the direction of the corporate enterprise is not possible. Faculty, for example maintain an extraorganizational pattern of involvement (conferences, research grants, consulting) that transcends their lack of power in the college or university. It is something for the superman/superwoman with a vast reserve of energy to turn their self-control to.

● Is not on call to take some heroic journey to save some mythic community.

● The superman/superwoman challenges complex historical, economic and sociological forces. Superwoman/superman is the vehicle role to actually restore the executive to his lost will to lead (Jennings, 1960: 232).

● Supermen leaders (be they male or female) have a will to power. It is not the same power as the prince, and not the journey defining the hero in search of the Holy Grail.

● Bright Examples: Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr. Nelson Mandela

● Dark Examples: Napoleon, Hitler, Mussolini, & Stalin. For more on what is postmodern, see POSTMODERN.